REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1, 4-12, 15-18 and 21-32 were pending. In this amendment, claims 1, 11, 18, and 28-30 are amended. Claims 31-32 are canceled and claims 33-35 are added. No new matter is added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1, 4-12, 15-18, 21-30, and 33-35 will be pending.

Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview with counsel, David B. Raczkowski, on October 3, 2008 in which differences of the cited references from the claims were discussed and confirmed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a), Dutta and Sbisa

Claims 1, 4-6, 11, 15, 18, and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,636,854 issued to Rabindranath Dutta et al ("Dutta") and US Patent 6,714,539 issued to Daniel Charles Sbisa ("Sbisa").

Claim 1

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references, either alone or in combination, as those references fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites:

> *extracting a plurality of queries from a plurality of query messages*
> *received from a plurality of users over the network;*
> *creating a first request message <u>including the plurality of queries</u> and a*
> *<u>first sequence number</u> associated with one or more of the queries;*
> *sending the first request message to a search engine;*
> *receiving a response message from the search engine, the response*
> *message <u>including a plurality of replies</u> and <u>the first sequence number</u>, wherein*
> *the first sequence number is associated with one or more of the replies, and*
> *wherein each reply associated with the first sequence number is generated in*
> *response to a query also associated with the first sequence number.*

At page 2, the Office Action asserts that the server's 406 receiving of a search request from a client 402 and the server's 406 forwarding to the search engine 410 teach the claimed extracting, creating, and sending. *See Dutta*, FIGS. 4 and 6A, col. 12 lines 54-56. In

Appl. No. 10/674,820
Amdt. dated November 10, 2008
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2167

PATENT

Dutta, each search request received from a user is forwarded <u>separately</u> from the server 406 to the search engine 410. *Id.*, col. 7 lines 40-48 and lines 64-65.

Thus, even if the server 406 does create a message from a search request received from a user, such a message would contain only <u>one</u> query.

Additionally, when Dutta talks about sending a search request from the server 406 to the nodes 420-428, the query message is the same as the <u>single</u> request received from the user. *Id.*, col. 8 lines 59-62. Accordingly, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest "*creating a first request message including the <u>plurality</u> of queries,*" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Dutta only describes sending a message containing results corresponding to <u>one</u> search request. *Id.*, col. 7 lines 50-52. ("If a query hit is generated, then the search results are returned to client 302, and the browser application displays the results for the user.") Thus, at no time, is a response message received that contains a <u>plurality</u> of search results, each generated in response to a user's query. Accordingly, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest "*the response message including a <u>plurality</u> of replies.*"

Moreover, the Office Action has not pointed to a teaching or a suggestion that a search request and search results contain the same sequence number associated with one or more queries and one or more replies.

Note that the cited teachings of Sbisa fail to make up for the deficiencies in Dutta.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over these references. Support for amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in paragraphs 33-39 and FIG. 9.

Other Claims

Applicants submit that independent claims 11 and 18, and their respective dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the same rationale as discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections under USC § 103, Dutta, Sbisa, Meek and Uehara

Claims 7-10 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta and Sbisa in view of US Patent Publication Number 2003/0138091 issued to William Meek et al ("Meek") and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 200210040414 issued to Kaitaro Uehara ("Uehara").

Note that the cited teachings of Meek and Uehara fail to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in Dutta and Sbisa. Thus, these claims are allowable for at least the same rationale as their respective independent claims from which they depend.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Raczkowski/

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
DBR:scz
61442255 v1